REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17-25, 27-29, and 31 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 13, 17, 23, and 27 are amended. Claim 31 is new. No new matter has been added. Supports for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17-25, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloch et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,922,408 B2) in view of Jones et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,944,173 B1) in further view of Takase et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,023,799 B2). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, 13, 17, 23, and 27 to more clearly point out the claimed subject matter. Claim 1 is directed to a method that at the link transmitter selects a logical channel from a plurality of logical channels and assigns at least one of the plurality of data credits to the logical channel. The Examiner has acknowledged that Bloch fails to anticipate these limitations. Applicant submits that Jones also fails to anticipate these limitations.

Jones at best appears to disclose that the receiver (12) designates each of the virtual channel credit packets to a specific virtual channel. Jones, col. 3., ll. 19-21. The receiver (12) checks if there is any available buffer for a specific virtue channel (VCN "N"). Once an available buffer is found, the receiver (12) assigns a virtual channel credit

packet (22) to the virtual channel (VCN "N") and then sends the virtual channel credit packet (22) to the transmitter. Jones, col. 3., ll. 44-49. The transmitter checks if there is an available buffer for the virtual channel (VCN "N"). If there is, the transmitter then looks for the virtual channel credit packet (22) which is assigned to the virtual channel (VCN "N") by the receiver (12). Jones, col. 4, ll. 16-35. In other words, Jones at best discloses that the receiver assigns a virtual channel credit packet to a virtue channel, rather than that the transmitter assigns a virtual channel credit packet to a virtue channel; the transmitter merely looks for a virtual channel credit packet that is already assigned to a specific virtual channel by the receiver.

In the claimed invention, the link transmitter receives a plurality of data credits that corresponds to the free buffer pool at the receiver and that have not been assigned to specific logical channels yet. The link transmitter then determines and selects logical channels to assign data credits.

Applicant further submits that Takase is silent about the above limitations.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5, 7-8 and 31 define over the art cited by the Examiner. Claim 9 and its dependent claims 10-11, claim 13 and its dependent claims 14-15, claims 17 and its dependent claims 18-22, claim 23 and its dependent claims 24-25, as well as claim 27 and its dependent claims 28-29, define over the art cited by the Examiner for one or more reasons set forth regarding claim 1.

NEW CLAIMS

Applicant has added new claim 31. Claim 31, depending from claim 1, is directed to a method that selects a logical channel based on traffic conditions of the plurality of logical channels and assigns data credits to the selected logical channel. In other words, the link transmitter determines data packets from which logical channels should be transmitted to the receiver based on the traffic condition of the logical channels at the transmitter.

Bloch and Takase are silent about the above limitations. Jones at best appears to disclose that the transmitter transmits data packets of a virtual channel that is determined by the receiver via a virtual channel credit packet.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 31 defines over the art cited by the Examiner.

DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1, 5-12, and 23-26 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, 5-9, 14-17, and 19-21 of copending Application No. 10/671203. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that the claims of copending Application No. 10/671203 cited by the Examiner each at least do not presently define the limitations of at the link transmitter selecting a logical channel from a plurality of logical channels and assigning a data credit to the logical channel.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 9, 2008

By: /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/PFD/evm